

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 09/518,287 | 03/03/2000 | David A. Foti | 04899-034001 | 6548 |
| 75 | 590 10/06/2004 | | EXAM | INER |
| Kevin J. Canning, Esq. | | | TRUONG, LECHI | |
| Lahive & Cock 28 State Street | field, LLP | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER | | |
| Boston, MA 02109 | | | 2126 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004 | 4 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/518,287 | FOTI ET AL. | | | | |
| Advisory Action | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | LeChi Truong | 2126 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 26 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average in a rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl | ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in | | | | |
| | EPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin | | in the final rejection subjectors in later. In | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai | g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | | | | | |
| (a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (| see NOTE below); | | | | |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note by | pelow); | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application is issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mate | erially reducing or simplifying the | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancel | ng a corresponding number of f | inally rejected claims. | | | | |
| NOTE: | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| 5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See | reconsideration has been cons e Continuation Sheet. | idered but does NOT place the | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which were newly | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w | t(s) a)⊡ will not be entered or b ould be rejected is provided belo |)⊠ will be entered and an ow or appended. | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: none. | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: none. | | • | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-34. | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app | roved or b) disapproved by | the Examiner. | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | SUPER TE | CMENDAL T. AN VICTOR PATENT EXAMINER LINE CENTER 2100 | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In the remark applicant argued in substance that (1) " Cantin does not teach or suggest retrieving a set of method signature" (2) " Cantin does not concerned with method signatures, or with comparing the data type of arguments of a method signature" (3) NEC fails to teach or suggest the claim limitations of ranking the method signatures as a function of comparison and selecting one of the method signatures according to the ranking", (4) " ranking the datatype of a method signature in comparison to the data type of an input parameter", (5) " Cantin does not discuss the PDS as providing an environment, such as one provided by a mathematic tool", (6) " The SchemaMapper and the PDS do not select method signatures".

Examiner respectfully traversed Applicant's remarks:

As to the point (1), Cantin teaches selected object (page 2, In 47-48) and (page 5, In 22-23), the objects must be selected based on the identifications or types of that objects which made the objects are different for each other. The object can not be selected without selecting the indentification of the object. Cantin teaches each objects have the persistant ID(page 2, In 22-23/page 8, In 5) or th object class DOG can include the instance variables "dog_type" (col 5, In 43-5). Canten teaches the selected object is mapped to persisten medium (page 2, In 46-48) or map between type of persitent object and the datastore(page 5, In 22-23).

As to the point(2), Cantin teaches Canten teaches the selected object is mapped to persisten medium (page 2, ln 46-48) or map between type of persitent object and the datastore(page 5, ln 22-23).

As to point(3), Nec teaches value is compared for every member variable defined as this structure type, and size-related rank is performed (page 4/27, right col/ page 9/27, right col), perform search processing of index component (page 12/27, right col/ page 14/27, right col), return retrieval result (page 17/27, right col), Nec teaches comparing and ranking between class, value and every member variable defined as structure type in object oriented environment.

As to the point (4), "ranking the datatype of a method signature in comparison to the data type of an input parameter" was not in claims 1 and 23.

As to the point (4), " a mathematic tool" was not in claims 1 and 23.

As to the point(6), Nec teach searching and ranking index component(page 4/27, right col/ page 9/27, right col/ page 12/27, right col/, page 14/27, right col)...